

R E M A R K S

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner for his courtesy in granting the recent and further interview on October 4 at which time claim 1 as above amended, was presented and discussed. At that time, it was Counsel's understanding that claim 1, as now amended, would be acceptable. See, *inter alia*, the following:

Claim 1 now includes the following simple, effective, structure:

h) the first gauge being elongated in said first direction and extending proximate an end of the lug to travel past and proximate that lug end as the first gauge is moved in said first direction.

Accordingly, claim 1 clearly differs unobviously from Seger who has no gauge extending proximate an end of his "lug" 3 (actually a spindle nut, not a lug); and Seger has no gauge that travels past and proximate the end of his "lug" 3, as that gauge is moved in a first direction; and no art suggests this simple effective structure as it relates to a connector plate having a lug as defined. In Seger, bracket structure 1 and fastener 12 would obstruct movement of a gauge proximate "lug" 3; and Seger's gauge 9 teaches spacing of gauge remotely from his nut 3.

Serial No. 10/729,289

The remaining cited art is believed and urged to be even less pertinent than Seger, and particularly in respect of h) now incorporated in claim 1, and in respect of the totality of claim 1 as now presented.

Allowance is respectfully solicited, in view of the above.

Respectfully submitted,



William W. Haefliger
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 17,120
323 684-2707

WWH:ts
Docket 12,559